

Docket No.: 60,298-038

al allowing relative movement between said second scroll and at least one of said rotary motor and said shaft when said motor is driven in said second of said forward and reverse directions.

19. (New). A scroll compressor as recited in Claim 17, wherein said one of said forward and reverse directions is a forward direction.

20. (New). A scroll compressor as recited in Claim 18, wherein said transmission includes a planetary gear transmission.

REMARKS

Applicant has now amended this application in response to a telephone conversation with the Examiner. The Examiner noted that Applicant's previous response was apparently directed to the *Sisk* U.S. patent, rather than the *Sisk, et al.* U.S. Patent 4,137,798. Applicant apologizes for any confusion.

However, the comments made in the previous response are as applicable to the *Sisk, et al.* patent. Moreover, the new claims are allowable over the *Sisk, et al.* patent.

The new claims all require that when the motor is driven in either the forward, or as in Claim 18, one of forward or reverse, drive is transmitted to the second scroll member without passing through the transmission which affects the rotational speed. Such a result was implicit in the original claims, such as in Claim 1 which requires the orbiting scroll cyclically orbit at a first rate which is approximately equal to the forward speed. Similarly, Claim 12 requires that the second scroll moves in a forward direction at a speed which approximates the speed of the motor when the motor is driven in the forward direction.

Sisk, et al. cannot meet these limitations, as in *Sisk, et al.*, drive in both forward or reverse passes through the planetary transmission. By passing through the planetary

A

Docket No.: 60,298-038

transmission, some change to the speed will occur. Moreover, the new Claims 16-20 also would not be met. In *Sisk, et al.*, drive always must pass through a planetary transmission. This is potentially noisy and unreliable. In Applicant's claimed invention, the drive in at least one direction does not pass through any mechanical transmission which affects the speed. Rather, the one-way clutch ensures that the drive is relatively direct in one direction. This reduces the operational noise of the scroll compressor, and will further lead to better assurance of proper drive in at least one of the directions. The claimed invention thus distinguishes over *Sisk, et al.*, even accepting the propriety of the combination rejection.

However, Applicant again contests the propriety of the combination rejection. A scroll compressor must never be driven in a reverse direction. This is a main goal of scroll compressor designers. Applicant is aware of certain unique situations, wherein a scroll compressor is purposely driven in a reverse direction at shut-down for a period of a few seconds to reduce entrapped gas loads. However, no scroll compressor would be driven in a reverse direction during an operational cycle. Thus, the workers in this art would not think to utilize a scroll compressor into the *Sisk, et al.* environment since operation in the reverse direction is so undesirable for a scroll compressor.

A